

the Greater Cleveland community. Dr. Milagros Acevedo Cruz, Michelle Melendez, Mario Ortiz, David Plata, Raquel Santiago, Lydia Esparra, Orlando Salinas, Ana Garcia, Yolanda Perdomo, and Jundy Caraballo. I hope that my fellow colleagues will join me in honoring these individuals and praising the Puerto Rican people as they celebrate Constitution Day.

IN RECOGNITION OF KATHLEEN S. BLACKMAR

HON. PATRICK J. KENNEDY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1998

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention the recognition of a Warren post office employee who was recently recognized as the Federal Employee of the Year in Rhode Island. Kathleen S. Blackmar was honored at the 27th annual awards ceremony held at the BankBoston Operations Center in East Providence by the Federal Executive Council of Rhode Island. She was nominated for the award by Warren postmaster Erick B. Lawson.

Kathy has become known as a very valuable asset to the Warren post office. In her job as custodian, she is responsible for making building repairs, performing janitorial duties, and assisting customers with lost or broken post office box keys. Her fellow workers share the belief that she has a work ethic that cannot be identified by level of job title. She has educated herself about boiler repair and diagnosis and she makes minor repairs to the office's fleet of vehicles. On top of this, Ms. Blackmar maintains and landscapes the grounds and clears snow. She readily has given her time to serve as coordinator for the Combined Federal Campaign, the annual drive for the contribution to community organizations. She has also coordinated the post office's Toys for Tots campaign and the annual "Christmas Wish List."

I am proud to recognize Kathleen Blackmar as an outstanding individual and to commend her for her contribution to public service.

30TH ANNIVERSARY OF LOCKPORT HIGH SCHOOL 100-MILE RELAY RECORD

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1998

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of our colleagues the 30th anniversary of an extraordinary high school track and field record that still stands today. In June, 1968, eight members of Lockport Senior High School in Lockport, New York ran the 100-mile relay in a time of seven hours, 27 minutes and 53.6 seconds. This mark beat the previous New York State record by a beat nine minutes. It is also an astonishing 26 minutes 36.5 seconds faster than the existing world record as listed in the Guinness Book of Records. And that so-called world record involved 100 runners—not eight.

Members of the record-setting relay team, led by Coach John Chew, were Jim Rycyna,

Charlie Quagliano, Bob Brown, Brian Brooks, Jeff Helshoff, Frank Pfeil, George Bickford, and Jeff Watkins. Each of these student-athletes ran 12½ miles in spurts of 110 yards, 220 yards, and 440 yards. The overall average time was less than four minutes and 30 seconds per mile.

Mr. Speaker, the State of New York recently passed a resolution congratulating the 1968 Lockport High School relay team, and the Mayor of Lockport issued a proclamation commending their achievement. I too am pleased to recognize these eight men on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of their 100-mile relay record, and ask all Members to join me in congratulating them as they reunite this month to celebrate their tremendous athletic performance.

OUR WAR ON DRUGS BEST WEAPON: GOOD PERSONNEL—HELP, DON'T HINDER, OUR CUSTOMS EMPLOYEES

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1998

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I had the honor and privilege to speak to the National Treasury Employees Union and other national law enforcement groups. I outlined the successes that Customs employees have had in our War on Drugs and spoke of my opposition to H.R. 3809, which would undermine that success.

In my own district, Robert Hood, a Customs inspector, is considered one of the "Best of the West" in Operation Brass Ring, a concerted effort to increase drug seizures among all agencies policing the border. From February through June of this year, Robert lead the San Diego region in drug interdiction, seizing more than 8,745 pounds of marijuana and 11 pounds of methamphetamine. Robert Hood is joined by other heroes—in the San Diego Customs area, the valiant men and women policing the border have been responsible for nearly tripling the amount of cocaine and methamphetamine seized, while the number of seizures of marijuana have nearly doubled.

In just the past six months, Customs personnel have made an incredible impact on the amount of drugs getting to our streets and into our children's pockets! That is why the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Association of Police Organizations, and the Border Patrol Council, among others, join me in opposing H.R. 3809 and asking those who support it, "What could you be thinking?"

The bill undermines the partnership that has flourished between Customs personnel and their managers in the successful drug interdiction efforts. It would restrict employees' rights to have significant input on safety issues—and it would cut their pay. How does cutting Customs' employees' pay for working their regular night shifts help to bolster our War on Drugs? I simply don't understand it.

I support the provisions in H.R. 3809 that boost 1999 funding for Customs, and I urge the Senate and the President to also support an increase in Customs funding, while rejecting the provisions that cut Customs personnel negotiating rights and their hazard pay for essential nighttime shifts.

H.R. 3809 gives us tools to fight the War on Drugs, but puts those who will use the tools in straightjackets. We will lose the War on Drugs and waste taxpayers' money if we spend money on expensive, cutting-edge equipment at the same time we undermine employee morale and labor standards.

Listen to the partners in the War on Drugs—police officers know they cannot win the war if Customs efforts to keep drugs from entering the country are thwarted. I support the front-line soldiers in the War on Drugs—our Customs personnel—and urge support only for legislation that enhances, rather than detracts, from their good work.

IN HONOR OF DR. MARGARET STORTZ AND REV. VICTOR POSTOLAKI, MINISTERS OF THE FIRST CHURCH OF RELIGIOUS SCIENCE

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1998

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is with honor that I share with you the accomplishments and religious commitment of Dr. Margaret Stortz and Rev. Victor Postolaki, who will be honored by the First Church Religious Science on Sunday, July 26 in Oakland, California.

Dr. Stortz will be stepping down as senior minister after 14 years and Rev. Postolaki, as assistant minister after 12 years of service. As ministers each has provided guidance and support to its congregants and the residents of Oakland and the East Bay.

As leaders of First Church, they encouraged community outreach on an economic level and have generated monies to assist the survivors of the 1989 Loma Prieta Earthquake, the Oakland Firestorm. Their fund-raising efforts such as the "Love Project" in conjunction with Allen Temple Baptist Church assisted in the rebuilding of the Black churches burned in the south, the North Dakota Flood, and the Mexico Earthquake. They have, through the church volunteer programs, arrange for the creation and distribution of grocery baskets and food vouchers for numerous economically disadvantaged families and organizations servicing this constituency.

They worked with Bay Area Ministries to make Oakland a better community for all its residents. Both were concerned about youth and were actively involved in programs that educated our children specially the teen empowering program serving the East Bay.

Dr. Stortz served as Assistant Minister in 1981 and as the senior minister since 1984. In 1983, she was elected President of the Northern California United Church of Religious Science. Over the years Dr. Stortz held numerous offices within the United Church of Religious Science organization as member of the International Board of Trustees and the President of the United Church of Religious Science.

Besides her ministerial duties she is an author and has an extensive list of works. Her written works include *Start Living Every Day of Your Life*, *How to Enjoy Life and Flight into Life*. She has produced *Seven Spiritual Laws of Success* based on Deepak Chopra's Book of the *You Prosper, We Prosper*—a 10-day

prosperity meditation series, and *Here's to Your Health*—a 10-day health meditation series. She has written articles for the *Oakland Tribune* regarding the local clergy. Dr. Stortz served as a member of the Oakland Police and Clergy Together, and trained numerous assistant ministers.

Rev. Postolaki, originally from Romania, prior to coming to First Church, served the Santa Rosa Church, both as a Practitioner and as an Assistant Minister. In 1986 he became the assistant minister at First Church of Religious Science, Oakland. He conducted weekly circles of Prayer and headed the Pastoral Care.

Rev. Postolaki has brought his spiritual strength, his creativity, and his artistic talents to First Church. He created unique banners reflecting the world's religious beliefs and "The Season for Non-Violence" banner honoring the anniversaries of the deaths of Mahatma Gandhi and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Dr. Stortz and Rev. Postolaki have been pillars whose commitment has established First Church as a fifty-year-old Oakland spiritual institution.

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN INTEGRITY ACT OF 1997

SPEECH OF

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2183) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes:

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment by Mr. PAXTON to the bill being discussed on campaign finance reform. This amendment would require labor unions to report all financial activities under current labor laws by categories, such as organizing activities and strike activities and political activities. The amendment further requires that reports be posted on the Internet.

These provisions single out unions for special treatment. They would impose expensive, burdensome regulations upon the organizations that represent working people. Companies are not subject to such treatment. This would further tilt the political playing field towards corporations and against working families.

The amendment imposes a substantial accounting burden on union members. It is the responsibility of the Department of Labor to determine the appropriate level of accounting that is needed to fulfill the requirements of American labor laws. This measure amounts to harassment and discrimination against labor unions.

Also, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is clearly a "poison pill." It is part of a continuing effort to load up the major, bipartisan campaign finance reform proposal with provisions that will drive away certain categories of supporters. The attempt is NOT to further campaign finance reform for the good of the American people. The purpose is to obstruct the process. I therefore urge my colleagues to defeat this destructive amendment.

FUNDING OF THE NEA AND CENSORSHIP

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1998

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have printed in the RECORD statements by high school students from my home State of Vermont, who were speaking at my recent town meeting on issues facing young people today.

FUNDING OF THE NEA AND CENSORSHIP

(By Daniel Luzer)

There has been a great deal of controversy lately about the National Endowment for the Arts. The Supreme Court is expected to rule in July in the case of National Endowment for the Arts versus Finley to decide if the federal law requiring the head of the Endowment to consider general standards of decency and respect for the diverse beliefs and views of the American public when considering whether or not to award a grant. In Congress last month, Senator John Ashcroft, together with Senator Jesse Helms, attempted, in an appropriations bill, to kill the endowment program entirely.

From the beginning, the National Endowment for the Arts has been a controversial program. Certainly the endowment is a valuable program. Before 1965, when the endowment was instituted, the arts were, to a great extent, still on the fringes of society and accessible only to the cultural elite. Since then, the arts have expanded greatly, and are now accessible to the masses and have thus begun to educate the majority, which was the point.

In the words of Maryanne Peters, the President of the Board of Directors of the National Campaign for Freedom of Expression, "In creating the NEA, Congress recognized that the arts are integral to fostering imaginative thinking in our culture." In the 33 years which the National Endowment for the Arts has existed, the role of art in our culture has greatly increased. One of the main contributions that the Endowment has made to our culture is to expand the American art world from a largely market-driven world to a system which allows artists to explore and to expose communities to new creative fields, without having to worry about how to purchase materials, or even purchase food.

It is important to remember, though, that money from the National Endowment for the Arts is a prize, bestowed upon artists whose work is either exceptionally good or greatly needed in a given community. Artists who receive money from the Endowment are singled out for the content of the work. Organizations like National Campaign for Freedom of Expression would like us to believe that the law requiring the head of the Endowment to consider standards of decency when awarding grants amounts to a violation of the rights to free speech.

This line of reasoning is flawed, however, in that The First Amendment to the Constitution states that "Congress shall make no law restricting freedom of speech." The fact of the matter is that the above-mentioned law is not a law restricting freedom of speech. The National Endowment for the Arts is not an organization which punishes artists for poor quality work; it is an organization which awards prizes to artists of first quality.

The law simply requires potential grant-givers to consider decency with respect to art. The law does not restrict the freedom to

speak in any way, since no artist is restricted from anything; they will simply find it slightly more difficult to receive federal money for offensive work, which seems a logical and acceptable state for an artist to be in. So the law is not unconstitutional.

That being said, the other issue that artists and artists' groups have brought up is the law's potentially harmful vagueness, which could lead to arbitrary and dangerous selection and rejection of an artist's work, which is absurd in a federal program, where standards are needed in order to determine an artistic piece's relevance in relation to the policies and purpose of the National Endowment for the Arts.

This is certainly a legitimate concern, and one which needs to be addressed in order for the National Endowment for the Arts to continue to function in a manner that benefits society. What the National Endowment for the Arts needs to continue in a way that benefits America are clearer laws and a stricter codification of the grant system. In this way, artists can be granted money based on whether and where their work is needed. If a given community was seriously lacking in, say, quality theater, then playwrights could be sent, with NEA grants, to the said community.

To a certain extent, the National Endowment for the Arts already works in this manner. However, greater clarity on this issue would lead to a better relationship between the art and political communities, which would decrease artists' frustration and improve the quality of the overall art program in the United States.

This plan does, to a certain extent, lead to discrimination against certain forms of art. While that is unfortunate, there is no way that the United States government could ever equally support all forms of art. But that was never the purpose of the National Endowment for the Arts. Another objection that could be raised for this plan for greater codification of the endowments program is that placing restrictions would adversely affect the quality of art. While that is a legitimate concern, as the arts are an expression of emotion, it is important to realize that, in order for the arts to flourish, they do not need to be unrestricted. Some of the greatest works of art were created under severe restrictions. The entire Renaissance, which for example, produced such masterpieces as Michelangelo's Sistine Chapel, Donatello's Madonna and Child, and Dante's Divine Comedy, was funded in large part by the Florentine banking families, not to mention the Vatican.

An additional argument against the idea of greater codification for the National Endowment for the Arts might be that the organization would therefore not be supporting the artistic community at all, since the award of grants would be based on the need for certain artists, rather than absolute support for artistic expression. One needs to realize, however, that the purpose of the National Endowment for the Arts should not be to encourage artistic expression among the artistic community. That would exist whether the National Endowment for the Arts does or not.

The purpose for the NEA ought to be to support the viewers of art, extending their horizon so as to foster the greater artistic understanding of the nation as a whole, not to support the ever-expanding imagination of the elite artistic community.

STATEMENT BY DAN WELCH REGARDING
VERMONT EDUCATION STANDARDS

My name is Dan Welch, and two years ago—well, last year, second semester, I was